REMARKS

The claims have been amended in a sincere attempt to place the case in condition for allowance. The non-elected method claims have been canceled leaving claims 51 to 65 (claim 65 being newly added) before the Examiner. Applicant will rely upon the protections afforded by 35 USC 121 regarding any divisional application directed to the canceled subject matter.

The objection to the claims for containing the phrase "pixel electrodes which are divided minutely" is noted. Claim 51 has been amended to strike the phrase "which are divided minutely", which action is believed to be that requested by the Examiner. Should the Examiner consider other language more appropriate, he is asked to contact the undersigned.

Minor obvious changes have been made in claim 52. New claim 65, directed to a particular aspect of the invention, has been added; claim 65 depends from claim 52.

The indication that claims 53 and 56 to 61 contain allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. Applicant

respectfully submits for reasons given below that all of claims 51 to 65 are allowable here.

Claims 51 and 52 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly anticipated by Noguchi '875. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the slit on two sides shown in Noguchi '875 creates an incline in the same way as the instantly claimed inclined surface, one said to be constituted "such that an electric field direction of the liquid crystal between at least one pair of adjacent pixels is inclined against an electrode plane." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The difference between what is accomplished by the slit in Noguchi '875 and the particular inclined surface of the instant claims can be understood by referring to the particular embodiment depicted in new claim 65 calling for a side of the pixel electrode to be opposite to the opposite electrode, and the other side of the pixel electrode to be opposite to the non-conductive portion. In that arrangement, an inclined electric field 11 occurs in the side 1a of the pixel electrode 1 opposite the non-conductive portion 5 (see instant Fig. 14), and a liquid

crystal molecule 71 above side 1a is inclined so that its major axis is at a right angle to a direction of the electric field 11. Each pixel p has an area in which a liquid crystal molecule 71 above side 1a of the pixel electrode 1 is inclined for the non-conductive portion 5 of the opposite electrode 3 opposite the pixel p; see generally the discussion in the specification at page 49, line 22 to at least page 53 line 11, and particularly page 52, lines 10 to 19 with reference to Fig. 14.

Noguchi '875, in contrast, discloses a liquid element provided with a slit on a portion of the opposite electrode.

Fig. 2 of the reference shows that the slit is provided on opposite electrode 124 opposite to signal line 127; slit 130 is not provided in a portion opposite to a side of pixel electrode 107. Thus, the direction of the electric field of the liquid crystal is not inclined in the manner required in the present claims. Those claims, accordingly, patentably define over the reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging that certified copies of the priority documents were filed in an earlier

application and for listing references provided with an Information Disclosure Statement.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 51 to 65 are in condition for allowance and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are required in the case prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLB

Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 429-6415

CAW/cd

Old Attorney Docket: OHOH:026A New Attorney Docket: 28951.3026/D1